IPW

AF

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 200401494-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Iddys D. Figueroa et al.	Confirmation No.: 3173
Application No.: 10/801,381	Examiner: E. Cameron
Filing Date: March 15, 2004	Group Art Unit: 1762

Title: APPLICATION OF A BIOACTIVE AGENT TO A DELIVERY SUBSTRATE

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on February 6, 2007.

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) $500.00.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

☐ (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d)) for the total number of months checked below:

☐ 1st Month $120	☐ 2nd Month $450	☐ 3rd Month $1020	☐ 4th Month $1590

☐ The extension fee has already been filed in this application.

☒ (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account 08-2025 the sum of $ 500. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

☒ I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Date of Deposit: April 6, 2007

OR

☐ I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571)273-8300.
Date of facsimile:
Typed Name: Christie A. Doolittle
Signature: Christie A. Doolittle

Respectfully submitted,
Iddys D. Figueroa et al.
By Walter W. Karnstein
Walter W. Karnstein
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg No. : 35,565
Date : April 6, 2007
Telephone : 503.224.6655

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of			Dated: April 6, 2007
IDDYS D. FIGUEROA, et al.			HP Docket No. 200401494-1
Serial No.	:	10/801,381	Examiner Erma C. Cameron
Filed	:	March 15, 2004	Group Art Unit 1762
For	:	APPLICATION OF A BIOACTIVE AGENT TO A DELIVERY SUBSTRATE	

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

S i r :

BRIEF OF APPELLANTS

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP, a limited partnership established under the laws of the State of Texas and having a principal place of business at 20555 S.H. 249 Houston, TX 77070, U.S.A. (hereinafter "HPDC"). HPDC is a Texas limited partnership and is a wholly-owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company, a Delaware Corporation, headquartered in Palo Alto, CA. The general or managing partner of HPDC is HPQ Holdings, LLC.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no known related appeals or interferences.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

The present application was filed on March 15, 2004 with original claims 1-28. In the response dated December 20, 2005, Appellants canceled claims 11-28, amended claim 3, and added new claims 29-34. In the response dated June 12, 2006, Appellants amended claims 1, 8, 29, and 34. In the Office action dated July 5, 2006, amended claim 34 was withdrawn from consideration. In the response dated October 5, 2006, the claims were not amended.

Claims 1-10, and 29-33 as amended in the response dated June 12, 2006 are the claims at issue in this appeal. Claims 1-10 and 29-33 stand rejected, claims 11-28 are canceled, and claim 34 is withdrawn from consideration.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments have been made subsequent to the Office action dated December 19, 2006.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The summary is set forth in exemplary embodiments. Discussions of selected elements and recitations of claimed subject matter can be found at least at the cited locations in the specifications and drawings. The claims of the present application are directed to methods of controlling dissolution rates of bioactive agents, as generally described at page 4, line 23 to page 21, line 13 of the specification, and as set out in Figures 1-10. The application of bioactive agents to a substrate in order to achieve a target dissolution rate is generally discussed at page 11, line 11 to page 21, line 3. More particularly, the particular placement of drops of bioactive agent solution in order to achieve a target dissolution rate is discussed at page 17, line 10 to page 18, line 18.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a method of controlling a dissolution rate of a bioactive agent, as shown in flowchart 100 of Fig. 10 and discussed at page 21, lines 4-13. The claimed method includes identifying a target dissolution rate, applying a first drop of solution carrying the bioactive agent at a first selected location on a delivery substrate 102, and positioning a second drop of solution carrying the bioactive agent at a second selected location on the delivery substrate. The location of the first drop and the location of the second drop are selected based on the previously identified target dissolution rate 104.

Independent claim 29 is directed to a method of controlling a dissolution rate of a bioactive agent, as shown in flowchart 100 of Fig. 10 and discussed at page 21, lines 4-13. The claimed method includes identifying a target dissolution rate, applying a first drop of solution carrying the bioactive agent at a first location on a delivery substrate at 102 of flowchart 100, selecting a second location on the delivery substrate from a plurality of possible second locations for placement of a second drop of solution carrying the bioactive agent. The second location is selected in relation to the first location based on the previously identified target dissolution rate. The second drop of solution is then positioned at the selected second location on the delivery substrate at 104 of flowchart 100.

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION

In the Office action dated December 19, 2007, claims 1-10 and 29-33 were rejected, and claim 34 was withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. More specifically,

- Claims 1-3, 6-8, 29-30, and 32-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Voss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,322,449);
- Claims 9-10 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,322,449);
- Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,322,449) as applied above, in view of Voges (U.S. Patent No. 5,894,841).

VII. ARGUMENT

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and/or 103

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 29-30, and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Voss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,322,449) . Appellants respectfully disagree that the Voss et al. reference discloses each and every element of the rejected claims, and suggests that Voss et al. fails to establish a *prima face* case of obviousness.

Independent claims 1 and 29 include the element "identifying a target dissolution rate" and the selection of a second drop location based on the target dissolution rate. In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a reference must teach each and

every element as set forth in the claim. That is, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (CAFC 1989). As there is no disclosure whatsoever in Voss et al. of identifying a target dissolution rate, or in fact *any* disclosure of dissolution rates, Appellants suggest that Voss et al. must necessarily fail to disclose each and every element as set forth in the claim.

Voss et al. teaches the control of various parameters of the application of pharmaceuticals onto a pharmaceutical carrier using a piezoelectric dosing system. In particular, Voss et al. discuss the particular parameters that may be used in order to control the dosage of a pharmaceutical applied to a carrier at column 4, lines 13-26 of the reference:

> The dosing may be controlled by one or more of the following parameters:
> (a) the diameter of the outlet opening of the nozzle channels;
> (b) the voltage applied to the piezoelectric oscillator;
> (c) the droplet frequency;
> (d) the number of nozzle channels;
> (e) the stroke intensity of the tubular or planar oscillator used;
> (f) the active substance concentration of the solution or suspension; and
> (g) the number of dots of active substance per pharmaceutical carrier.

Voss et al. stress that their disclosed method permits "extremely precise dosing of active pharmaceutical ingredients onto pharmaceutical carriers" (col. 1, lines 62-66), and that "exact dosing of these active substances is of special importance" (col. 1, lines 46-51).

While Appellants agree that precise dosing is important, they respectfully suggest that the dissolution rate of the pharmaceutical is also important, and distinct from dosage. As indicated in the specification at page 3, line 3 to page 4, line 2, control of the release profile of a pharmaceutical can be highly advantageous. For example, the effective duration of a medication may be extended by decreasing a dissolution rate, or the efficacy of a medication can be increased by increasing the dissolution rate. These, and other related effects, are *distinct* from simple precision in controlling the dosage of the medication.

The Examiner suggests that "controlling the dot pattern, the size or shape of the dot, or the consistency of the size of the dots will inherently provide control over the dissolution rate", and Voss et al. inherently discloses a method of applying a bioactive substance so as to arrive at a target dissolution rate. More particularly, the Examiner suggests that it would have been *inherent* for one of ordinary skill in the art to identify, in addition to a desired target dose, a target dissolution rate.

Appellants respectfully disagree. It has been established that the recitation of a newly discovered function or property, where that function or property is inherently possessed by things in the prior art, does not confer novelty on such claimed subject matter. However, that is not the fact pattern of the present rejection. Voss et al. is silent with respect to the selection of a target dissolution rate, and is silent with respect to what characteristics may confer a greater or lesser dissolution rate on applied pharmaceuticals. Furthermore, both the selection of a dissolution rate and the selection of a drop location based on that dissolution rate are elements of claims 1 and 20 that

involve an intent to achieve the target dissolution rate. These conscious and affirmative selections *cannot* be disclosed through mere inherency.

As stated by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, "inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient." *Continental Can Co. USA, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.*, 948 F.2d 1264, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1256 (Fed. Cir. 1991). That is, even if modification of the Voss et al. parameters *might* change the resulting dissolution rate is still not sufficient to establish anticipation.

Appellants therefore respectfully suggest that claims 1 and 29 are not anticipated by the Voss et al. reference, and therefore request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 6-8, 29-30, and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Alternatively, the Examiner suggests it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select a target dissolution rate to be achieved by the dot patterns of Voss to ensure the safe and effective administration of drugs to patients. Appellants respectfully disagree, and suggest that the Examiner has failed to establish the *prima facie* obviousness of the rejected claims.

In order to establish *prima facie* obviousness, the Examiner must satisfy three criteria. There must be some suggestion or motivation present in the prior art to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. The prior art must also provide a reasonable expectation of success. Additionally, the prior art references must teach or suggest each and every element of the claim.

As discussed above, Voss et al. fails disclose each and every element of the rejected claims, for example the elements "identifying a target dissolution rate" and the selection of a second drop location based on the target dissolution rate. Voss et al. fails to disclose the modification of a pharmaceutical dissolution rate through the selection of drop location at all.

Moreover, the Examiner has failed to provide a sufficient suggestion or motivation in the prior art to modify the reference teachings so as to arrive at the claimed invention, by suggesting that it would have been "inherent for one of ordinary skill in the art to identify, in addition to a desired target dose, a target dissolution rate" (Final Office action at page 5, lines 8-11). The Examiner suggests that, as medical professionals would have been aware of the importance of dissolution rate in administering medication, one of ordinary skill would have placed the drops of bioactive agent in such a way as to achieve a target dissolution rate. Appellants respectfully disagree.

The criteria for satisfying the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103 are intentionally strenuously high, precisely to prevent the trivial application of hindsight reconstruction of an otherwise patentable invention. For this reason obviousness can only properly be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is a specific teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so. In the present rejection, the Examiner is merely asserting that such motivation must necessarily exist. Such an assertion is insufficient for establishing the *prima facie* obviousness of the rejected claims.

Furthermore, the Examiner may not simply rely upon the level of skill in the art in order to provide the necessary suggestion to combine or modify the cited references. Merely because such a modification would have been "well within the ordinary skill of the art at the time of the invention'" is not sufficient to establish *prima facie* obviousness (see MPEP § 2143.01).

In the absence of a disclosure of each and every element of the rejected claims in the cited reference, or the identification of an appropriate suggestion or motivation to modify the teachings of the reference so as to arrive at the claimed invention, Appellants suggest the Examiner has failed to establish the *prima facie* obviousness of claims 1 and 29.

In view of the arguments present above, Appellants suggest that independent claims 1 and 29 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited reference. Appellants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As claims 2-3, 6-8, 30, and 32-33 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 29, Appellants suggest they are similarly not anticipated or rendered obvious by Voss et al.

Furthermore, claims 2, 8-10, and 30-31 recite the placement of drops that partially overlap, so as to create a target dissolution rate. The Voss et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest overlapping applied drops of pharmaceutical solution to achieve a targeted dissolution rate. Appellants therefore suggest that claims 2, 8-10, and 30-31 are additionally novel and unobvious over Voss et al.

The Examiner has rejected claims 9-10 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,322,449). Appellants traverse the rejection.

As discussed above, Appellants suggest that independent claims 1 and 29 are not rendered obvious by the Voss et al. reference. As claims 9-10 and 31 depend from claims 1 and 29, Appellants suggest they are similarly not rendered obvious by the cited reference.

In particular, the elements recited in the methods of claims 9-10 and 31 lend themselves to tailoring the dissolution rate of the applied bioactive agent to match a target dissolution rate. Voss et al. fails to disclose either the concept of a target dissolution rate, or how drop placement can be used to achieve the target dissolution rate. Appellants therefore suggest that claims 9-10 and 31 are not obvious in view of Voss et al., and that the rejection of claims 9-10 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,322,440) as applied above, in view of Voges (U.S. Patent No. 5,894,841).

As discussed above, Appellants suggest that Voss et al. fails to disclose each and every element of independent claims 1 and 29, and fails to provide a suggestion or motivation to modify the teachings of Voss et al. so as to arrive at the claimed invention.

The Voges reference is directed to a hand-held dispenser of droplets of medication for inhalation. As discussed in their specification, the parameters that may be varied in order to arrive at a target dissolution rate include delivery substrate selection, amorphous or crystal morphologies of deposited dots, shape of deposited dots, dot spacing, and dot overlap, among others. None of these parameters are relevant to the dispenser of Voges, which dispenses liquid droplets for inhalation. Similar to the apparatus of Voss et al., the medication *dosage* may be carefully controlled by varying the number of droplets applied, but the reference provides no suggestion as to how to modify the medication dissolution rate.

Furthermore, if the apparatus of Voges were modified so as to print onto a delivery substrate, as recited in the rejected claims, the modification would destroy the utility of the Voges dispenser for inhalation therapy. Where a modification of the prior art would destroy its stated utility, there can be no suggestion or motivation to modify that reference, as suggested by the Examiner.

In view of the above remarks, Appellants respectfully suggest that claims 4-5 are not rendered unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Voss et al., in view of Voges. Appellants therefore request the withdrawal of the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As discussed above, in the absence of a disclosure of each and every element of the rejected claims, the absence of specific motivation or suggestion in the cited reference to combine or modify the reference teachings as suggested by the Examiner, and in view of the teaching of the cited references. Claims 1-10, and 29-33 are neither anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) nor rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Appellants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of those claims.

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. (Previously Presented) A method of controlling a dissolution rate of a bioactive agent, the method comprising:

identifying a target dissolution rate;

applying a first drop of solution carrying the bioactive agent at a first selected location on a delivery substrate; and

positioning a second drop of solution carrying the bioactive agent at a second selected location on the delivery substrate, wherein the location of the first drop and the location of the second drop are selected based on the target dissolution rate.

2. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the first drop and the second drop at least partially overlap.

3. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the first drop and the second drop are spaced sufficiently to avoid coalescing.

4. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein applying the first drop of solution and positioning the second drop of solution includes heating solution carrying the bioactive agent with a thermal ejection element.

5. (Original) The method of claim 4, wherein the heated solution is applied via at least two nozzles sized to eject drops of solution having substantially the same volume.

6. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein applying the first drop of solution and positioning the second drop of solution includes displacing the solution carrying the bioactive agent with a piezoelectric ejection element.

7. (Original) The method of claim 6, wherein the displaced solution is applied via at least two nozzles sized to eject drops of solution having substantially the same volume.

8. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising positioning a plurality of drops of solution carrying the bioactive agent, each at a location selected based on the identified target dissolution rate.

9. (Original) The method of claim 8, wherein a standard deviation of distance between adjacent drops is less than approximately 15% of a mean distance between adjacent drops.

10. (Original) The method of claim 8, wherein a standard deviation of combined geometric surface area of overlapping drops is less than approximately 15% of a mean combined geometric surface area of overlapping drops.

29. (Previously Presented) A method of controlling a dissolution rate of a bioactive agent, the method comprising:

identifying a target dissolution rate;

applying a first drop of solution carrying the bioactive agent at a first location on a delivery substrate;

selecting a second location on the delivery substrate for placement of a second drop of solution carrying the bioactive agent from a plurality of possible second locations, the second location being selected in relation to the first location based on the identified target dissolution rate; and

positioning the second drop of solution at the selected second location on the delivery substrate.

30. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 29, wherein positioning the second drop effects a dot pattern with at least one dot at least partially overlapping with at least one other dot.

31. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 29, wherein positioning the second drop effects a dot pattern with at least one of the dot fully overlapping with at least one other dot.

32. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 29, wherein positioning the second drop effects a dot pattern with each dot discretely spaced from all other dots.

33. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 29, wherein the delivery substrate includes an ingestible media.

34. (Withdrawn) A method of controlling a dissolution rate of a bioactive agent, the method comprising:

identifying a desired surface-to-mass ratio;

applying a first drop of solution carrying the bioactive agent at a first location on a delivery substrate;

selecting a second location on the delivery substrate for placement of a second drop of solution carrying the bioactive agent, the second location being selected to overlap the first location sufficiently to achieve the identified desired surface-to-mass ratio; and

positioning the second drop of solution at the selected second location on the delivery substrate to achieve a dot pattern having the identified desired surface-to-mass ratio.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.

Respectfully submitted,

KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.

Walt W. Karnst

Walter W. Karnstein
Registration No. 35,565
520 S.W. Yamhill Street, Suite 200
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 224-6655
Facsimile: (503) 295-6679
Attorney for Appellants

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on April 6, 2007.

Christie A. Doolittle

Christie A. Doolittle